

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

KAMEL KK ROY,

Plaintiff,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et  
al.,

Defendants.

2:12-CV-863 JCM (PAL)

**ORDER**

Presently before the court is the report and recommendation of Magistrate Judge Peggy A. Leen (doc. #2) regarding plaintiff's motion to proceed in forma pauperis (doc. #1). No objections have been filed.

The magistrate judge recommends denying the motion to proceed in forma pauperis because the application is internally inconsistent, largely illegible, and unintelligible in many points. After reviewing the motion, the court agrees with the magistrate judge's assessment and adopts her recommendation.

The court further adopts the magistrate judge's recommendation to dismiss the complaint. The Supreme Court has explained that a district court may dismiss "claims whose factual contentions are clearly baseless," such as "claims describing fantastic or delusional scenarios." *Nietzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 327-28 (1989). Here, plaintiff has failed to state any cognizable claim under § 1983. Furthermore, plaintiff has failed to comply with the "simple, concise, and direct"

1 requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(e). He has filed a seventy-eight page complaint that the magistrate  
2 judge fairly characterized as “rambling, unintelligible allegations.”

3       Upon review of the magistrate judge’s recommendation and good cause appearing,

4       IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED, that the report and  
5 recommendation of Magistrate Judge Peggy A. Leen (doc. #2) regarding the plaintiff’s motion to  
6 proceed in forma pauperis (doc. #1) be, and the same hereby is, AFFIRMED in its entirety.

7       IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that plaintiff’s motion to proceed in forma pauperis (doc.  
8 #1) be, and the same hereby is, DENIED.

9       IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiff’s complaint (doc. #3) be, and the same hereby is,  
10 DISMISSED.

11       DATED June 27, 2012.

12  
13   
14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE